UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,771	10/20/2003	Hou-Wei Lin	REAP0438USA1	9601
27765 NOD TIL A ME	7590 08/16/2007	EXAMINER		
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506			AHN, SAM K	
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2611		
• .				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/16/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

			THE STATE OF THE S			
	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Supplemental		10/687,771	LIN ET AL.			
Office Action	on Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Sam K. Ahn	2611			
The MAILING DA	TE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHICHEVER IS LONG - Extensions of time may be averafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the - If NO period for reply is specification - Failure to reply within the set of	ER, FROM THE MAILING Dilable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. e mailing date of this communication. ed above, the maximum statutory period or extended period for reply will, by statutile later than three months after the mailing	AY IS SET TO EXPIRE MCDATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON (19) date of this communication, even if timely file.	timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. & 133)			
Status			•			
1) Responsive to co	mmunication(s) filed on 05/	21/01				
2a) This action is FIN	, and the second					
3) Since this applica	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accorda	ince with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims						
4a) Of the above 6 5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3 and</u> 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4-7</u> is/ar 7)□ Claim(s) is	e rejected.					
Application Papers		·				
9) ☐ The specification in 10) ☑ The drawing(s) file		accepted or b) objected to by				
•		e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Setion is required if the drawing(s) is o	` '			
		xaminer. Note the attached Office				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	•					
12) Acknowledgment a) All b) Some 1. Certified co 2. Certified co 3. Copies of t application	is made of a claim for foreign * c) None of: ppies of the priority documen ppies of the priority documen the certified copies of the prior from the International Burea	ts have been received in Applica prity documents have been recei	ation No ved in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Pa 3) Information Disclosure Stat Paper No(s)/Mail Date S Patent and Tredemark Office	tent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

1. In response to the letter filed 05/21/07, it is acknowledged that Final Action dated 05/02/07 was mailed out in error.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see p.8, filed 03/28/07, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive.
Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Jane et al. US 4,893,316.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 4 recites "(S/H) circuit for sampling and holding a receiving signal...", while claim 7 recites "...(AAGC), for adjusting the magnitude of the receiving signal...". Claim 6 recites "LPF for filtering ... the receiving signal". It appears that the claim is

reciting the configuration of figure 3 wherein element 15 is the AAGC provided with the "receiving signal". However, claim 4 recites (S/H) circuit also provided with the receiving signal.

Therefore, it appears from the claim recitation that "receiving signal" is provided in a parallel form to all the elements of 13,14 and 15 in Fig.3. However, the specification and figure 3 discloses wherein a signal received by AAGC 15 is provided to LPF 14 and the output of element 14 is provided to S/H 13. Therefore, the claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention of how the receiving signal is provided to both elements 15 and 13 and properly function, as claimed.

Claim 5 directly or indirectly depend on claim 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jane et al. US 4,893,316 (Jane).

Regarding claim 4, Jane teaches a front-end receiver of the communication system, comprising: a sample and hold (S/H) circuit for sampling and holding a

receiving signal (10 in Fig.1 receiving signal 12); a circuit (22 and 20) coupled to the S/H circuit (10) for generating a signal according to the sample-and-hold receiving signal (output of 10); and an analog-to-digital converter (ADC) for generating a digital-form signal according to the filtered receiving signal (24 in Fig.1). Jane further teaches wherein the circuit provides uniform power spectral density (note c.7, I.54-58) and so that the signal input to ADC is below maximum peak to peak voltage of the ADC (note c.7, I.41-47). And although Jane does not explicitly teach the inverse partial response (IPR) filter coupled to the S/H circuit for generating a filtered receiving signal according to the sample-and-hold receiving signal through compensating an ISI introduced by a partial response filter in a transmitter part of a remote transceiver, Jane further teaches IPR filter or IIR filter (filter in Fig.26a) in which the IIR filters are well-known in the art of compensating ISI. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the IPR or IIR filter in the summation circuit 20 in Fig.1 for the purpose of lowering the peak to peak voltage and compensating ISI prior to the ADC.

Regarding claim 5, Jane further teaches wherein IPR is an IIR filter, as explained in regards to claim 1.

Regarding claim 6, Jane teaches all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 5. And although Jane teaches low pass filter configured with ADC (note c.2, I.44-45), Jane does not explicitly teach LPF filtering the receiving signal At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement as such. Applicant has not disclosed that lowpass filtering the receiving signal provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with filtering at any part of the receiver because filtering in any part of the system is well-known and can be implemented without any novelty. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify the teaching of Jane to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jane et al.
 US 4,893,316 (Jane) in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Regarding claim 7, Jane teaches all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 6. However, Jane does not explicitly teach analog auto gain controller for adjusting the magnitude of the receiving signal to meet the operating range requirement of the LPF.

AAPA teaches analog auto gain controller for adjusting the magnitude of the receiving signal to meet the operating range requirement of the ADC in Fig.1. And although AAPA does not explicitly teach AAGC is provided to LPF, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art to implement as such. Applicant has not disclosed that lowpass filtering the receiving signal provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with filtering at any part of the receiver because filtering in any part of the system is well-known and can be implemented without any novelty. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify the teaching of Jane to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 1-3 and 8 are allowed.
- 6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: prior art does not explicitly teach the combined limitation of the front-end receiver comprising IPR filter providing its output to ADC, noise canceller, feed forward equalizer and the decoder as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-3044. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct uspto gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sam K. Ahn

Patent Examiner

8/9/07